



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/736,548	12/13/2000	Uwe Schumann	BEIERSDORF 685-WCG	5636
7590 11/25/2003			EXAMINER	
Norris McLaughlin & Marcus, P.A. 220 East 42nd Street 30th Floor New York, NY 10017			CHANG, VICTOR S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/736,548		Applicant(s) SCHUMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner Victor S Chang		Art Unit 1771	

All Participants:

(1) Victor S Chang, Examiner.

(2) Howard Lee, Attorney.

Date of Interview: 19 November 2003

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: After Final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1:30 pm

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
 NA

Claims discussed:
 NA


Prior art documents discussed:
 NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner apologized there was an apparent administrative error in the prior Office Action, which reopens the prosecution, and should have included the reasoning of reopening the case so as to provide a secondary reference as evidence of the state of the art so as to make the prosecution complete, and also should not have made the Office Action Final. Examiner asked Attorney if there is any particular concern or suggestion for the next Office Action, as the Examiner is willing to treat the prior Office Action as Non-Final, and reconsiderate the application. Attorney responded that he appreciates that the Examiner is trying to prosecute according to the rules of MPEP, he has no quarrel on the procedural matters, and he is only interested in getting an early conclusion, if the case is allowable, he is willing to make necessary further amendment, otherwise, since the work for appeal is already done, he would like to see an after-final Advisory, so as the case can move forward quickly. .